

Relation between Classical and Pseudo-classical Spinning Particle

Jin-Ho Cho^{† 1}, Seungjoon Hyun^{‡ 2} and Jae-Kwan Kim¹

¹ Department of Physics

Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology
373-1 Yusung-ku, Taejon, 305-338, Korea

² Institute for Mathematical Sciences

Yonsei University, Seoul, 120-749, Korea

The spin degrees of freedom for the relativistic particle are described by either Lorentz group variables (classically) or Grassmann variables (pseudo-classically). The relationship between those two descriptions are given. In doing that, appropriate constraints are constructed to put into the lagrangian. Especially a natural relation of Lorentz group variables and Grassmann variables is obtained. Hopf fibration relating the spin components to the group is just the right transformation of the spin components under Lorentz group. And with the relation just mentioned, pseudo-classical lagrangian is derived naturally from the classical one.

[†] (jycho@rcunix.kotel.co.kr)

[‡] (sjh92@krysucc1.BITNET)

Since the introduction of Clifford algebra by Dirac[1], several efforts have been made to understand the spin in the classical sense and, at least, two methods have been developed. In one approach, which we shall call ‘classical’ approach, the spin degrees of freedom are described by Lorentz group variables which can be introduced in the lagrangian by either the requirement of Poincaré invariance[2] or Hopf fibration[3] and the spin value is fixed arbitrarily. (But only integer or half integer values are possible at the quantum level[3][4].)

In the other, the spin degrees of freedom are described by Grassmann variables which also may be put into the lagrangian through either the classical analogue of Clifford algebra[5][6] or supersymmetry[7] – [9]. But in this case the spin is of zero magnitude due to the Grassmann property, whereas it obtains non zero value at the quantum level. So this latter case is especially called ‘pseudo-classical’.

In these developments, we have found that, in principle, the spin can be formulated classically and these give another good example for the constrained dynamical system. Now, we have a natural question about the relationship between those two formulations, as the answer to this question is expected to give us a large amount of insight about spin.

This paper is an attempt to answer the question. The main idea is that the antisymmetric property of the spin components can be realized by Grassmann variables. The cost for this realization is that we lose direct physical significance about the spin because its magnitude comes to zero. But we do not have to worry about that. We can always restore the nonzero magnitude through the quantization of the system. Therefore the Grassmann variable formulation may find its significance in the pseudo-classical sense.

In advance of the main story, for our convenience and notation fixing, it would be better to remind us those two ‘classical’ and ‘pseudo-classical’ formalisms for the spinning particle. Nonrelativistic spin comes in physics from the universal covering group $SU(2)$ of $SO(3)$. This can be realized through quantum mechanics just to understand Stern-Gerlach experiment. When it comes to quantum field theory or any relativistic theory, it is natural to extend $SO(3)$ to $SO(3,1)$. Considering the particle mass, we come to

Poincaré group $ISO(3, 1)$, which has two Casimir invariants (mass and spin). But we have only a few choices for the Poincaré invariant lagrangian[2]. One simple and natural choice is as follows[3][4].

$$\mathcal{L}_{cl} = p^a \dot{x}_a + \frac{i}{4} \lambda^{ab} Tr \sigma_{ab} \Lambda^{-1} \dot{\Lambda}, \quad (1)$$

where λ^{ab} is the component of a fixed element in $so(3, 1)$ along the generator σ_{ab} and $\Lambda \in SO(3, 1)$.

For the representation of $(\sigma_{ab})^{cd} = -i(\delta_a^c \delta_b^d - \delta_a^d \delta_b^c)$, which satisfies $[\sigma_{ab}, \sigma_{cd}] = -i(\sigma_{bc} \eta_{ad} + \sigma_{ad} \eta_{bc} - \sigma_{bd} \eta_{ac} - \sigma_{ac} \eta_{bd})$, the second term can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{L}_{spin} = \frac{i}{4} \lambda^{ab} Tr \sigma_{ab} \Lambda^{-1} \dot{\Lambda} = \frac{1}{2} \lambda^{ab} \Lambda_{cb} \dot{\Lambda}^c{}_a. \quad (2)$$

The spin components S^{ab} are related to Λ as

$$\frac{1}{2} S^{ab} \sigma_{ab} = \frac{1}{2} \lambda^{ab} \Lambda \sigma_{ab} \Lambda^{-1}, \quad (3)$$

which is a kind of Hopf projection reducing one degree of freedom of Λ to get a constraint surface ($S^2 = \lambda^2$) for the spin components.

In fact, making use of the property of Λ , $\mathcal{L}_{spin}$ can be redescribed as

$$\mathcal{L}_{spin} = \frac{1}{2} \lambda^{cd} \Lambda^a{}_c \Lambda^b{}_d \Lambda_a{}^e \dot{\Lambda}_{be} = \frac{1}{2} S^{ab} (\Lambda \dot{\Lambda}^{-1})_{ab} \quad (4)$$

and $\Lambda \dot{\Lambda}^{-1}$ is the relativistic analogue of angular velocity[2]. Hence the spin components defined by Hopf projection represent the right form of spin components transformed from some fixed one λ under $ISO(3, 1)$.

The system has two implicit constraints:

$$p^2 + m^2 = 0, \quad S^2 = \lambda^2, \quad (5)$$

where the first equation comes from the transformation property of momentum under $ISO(3, 1)$

$$p^a = \Lambda^a{}_b \rho^b, \quad \rho^2 = -m^2, \quad (6)$$

and the second comes from, as mentioned, that of spin components under $ISO(3,1)$, i.e., Hopf projection.

$$S^{ab} = \Lambda^a_c \Lambda^b_d \lambda^{cd}. \quad (7)$$

In [3], they gave another condition $S^{ab}p_b = 0$, to pick specific values of ρ and λ . But in our case, we do not interpret S^{ab} as the one which corresponds to nonrelativistic spin momentum. Such a physical spin momentum can be defined by the projection of the conserved angular momentum along the direction normal to p^a [10]. But that specific procedure is not necessary here.

The equations of motion can be derived in the standard way by the variation of x_a and Λ :

$$\delta x^a \implies \dot{p}^a = 0, \quad (8)$$

$$\delta \Lambda = i \epsilon^{ab} \sigma_{ab} \Lambda \implies j^{ab} = \frac{d}{d\tau} (x^a p^b - x^b p^a + S^{ab}) = 0. \quad (9)$$

Therefore the equations of motion describe the conservation of momentum and angular momentum.

But there is another way for the description of the spinning particle; classical mechanics can be generalized to include new Grassmann dynamical variables ψ^a which account for spin degrees of freedom[5]. Due to the anticommuting property of Grassmann variables, the plausible form of the lagrangian for the massless fermionic particle will be[10]

$$\mathcal{L}_{pcl} = p^a \dot{x}_a - \frac{1}{2} \psi^a \dot{\psi}_a. \quad (10)$$

But for the massive case, we get some hints from Dirac equation, which will reflect correct constraints, as Klein-Gordon equation does. That is, we get two constraints; $p^2 + m^2 = 0$ from Klein-Gordon equation and $p^a \psi_a + m \psi^* = 0$ from Dirac equation[10] (ψ^* adjusts the oddness of the second constraint). We take these as the first class in passing to the classical limit. So the full lagrangian will be

$$\mathcal{L} = p^a \dot{x}_a - \frac{1}{2} \psi^a \dot{\psi}_a - \frac{1}{2} \psi^* \dot{\psi}^* - N (p^2 + m^2) - M (p^a \psi_a + m \psi^*), \quad (11)$$

where N and M are bosonic and fermionic lagrange multiplier, respectively and the kinetic term for ψ^* is introduced to deal with ψ^* dynamically. There is another route to get the equation (11). At first, the requirement of global supersymmetry gives us the lagrangian (10). And the world line local supersymmetry leads us the very lagrangian (11) (ψ^* shows up to localize the cosmological term)[9]. A third path will be shown in the next section.

The equations of motion can be obtained by varying p^a , x^a , ψ^a , ψ^* , N and M .

$$\delta p^a \implies \dot{x}^a - 2Np^a - M\psi^a = 0, ??? \quad (12)$$

$$\delta x^a \implies \dot{p}^a = 0, \quad (13)$$

$$\delta \psi^a \implies \dot{\psi}^a - Mp^a = 0, \quad (14)$$

$$\delta \psi^* \implies \dot{\psi}^* - Mm = 0, \quad (15)$$

$$\delta N \implies p^2 + m^2 = 0, \quad (16)$$

$$\delta M \implies p^a \psi_a + m\psi^* = 0. \quad (17)$$

And Poincaré invariance generates conserved charges through Noether's procedure. The Poincaré behavior of the dynamical variables are as follows[10].

$$\delta x^a = \omega^a_b x^b + \varepsilon^a, \quad (18)$$

$$\delta p^a = \omega^a_b p^b, \quad (19)$$

$$\delta \psi^a = \omega^a_b \psi^b, \quad (20)$$

$$\delta \psi^* = 0, \quad (21)$$

with $\omega_{ab} = -\omega_{ba}$. The conserved charges are given also as

$$\dot{p}^a = 0, \quad J^{ab} = \frac{d}{d\tau} (x^a p^b - x^b p^a + \psi^a \psi^b) = 0. \quad (22)$$

Now we have two formalisms which describe the same object, i.e., the spinning particle. But they are different in their formulations. For the description of spin degrees of freedom, one considers Lorentz group elements dynamically while the other does Grassmann variables. And one deals with the constraints implicitly through Hopf projection whereas the other does those things explicitly in the lagrangian.

In spite of these differences, they also have features in common. They are Poincaré invariant with the same conserved charges and there are two constraints concerned with the transformation properties of momentum and spin components related with those conserved charges, under Poincaré group. And the two formalisms are of the first order for the spin variables. So we come to think of the relation between them.

For that purpose we first put the implicit constraints into the lagrangian in the first formalism. But we have a problem here. The constraint $p^2 + m^2 = 0$ is of good form to put into lagrangian, whereas $S^2 - \lambda^2 = 0$ is not since S^2 vanishes at the pseudo-classical level due to Grassmann property. And the constraint $S^{ab} = \Lambda^a_c \Lambda^b_d \lambda^{cd}$ is not desirable either as it contains Λ 's in the right hand side (we want such a form that the variables are constrained only by some fixed values like λ^{ab} or ρ^a). The appropriate candidate may come from the composition of p^a and S^{ab} given by constraints (6) and (7). Thus we use $\Lambda_a^k S^{ab} p_b - \lambda^{kb} \rho_b = 0$ to get the following term,

$$M_k (\Lambda_a^k S^{ab} p_b - \lambda^{kb} \rho_b) = 0, \quad (23)$$

where M_k 's are lagrange multipliers. Now lagrangian is written as

$$\mathcal{L} = p^a \dot{x}_a - N (p^2 + m^2) + \frac{1}{2} S^{ab} \Lambda_{ac} \dot{\Lambda}_b^c - M_k (\Lambda_a^k S^{ab} p_b - \lambda^{ka} \rho_a). \quad (24)$$

To get pseudo-classical lagrangian from this one, we make use of the anticommuting property of spin components. We represent λ^{ab} as $\theta^a \theta^b$, where θ 's satisfy $\{\theta^a, \theta^b\} = 0$. But for this representation, we cost the value of λ^2 . So this may be called 'pseudo-classical representation'.

We can also obtain dynamical variable ϕ corresponding to Λ through $\phi^a = \Lambda^a_b \theta^b$. Then ϕ 's also satisfy $\{\phi^a, \phi^b\} = 0$, which can be checked easily. And we may restore Lorentz element from ϕ by differentiation, as the variable ϕ is linear in θ and the coefficient is the element of Lorentz group $SO(3, 1)$ (see the appendix).

Now we rephrase the lagrangian in terms of ϕ . The spin components become

$$S^{ab} = \theta^c \theta^d \Lambda^a_c \Lambda^b_d = \phi^a \phi^b \quad (25)$$

and the kinetic term for spin variable changes also as

$$\frac{1}{2} \lambda^{ab} \Lambda_{cb} \dot{\Lambda}^c_a = \frac{1}{2} \theta^a \theta^b \Lambda_{cb} \dot{\Lambda}^c_a = -\frac{1}{2} \phi_c \dot{\phi}^c. \quad (26)$$

And the second constraint term becomes

$$M_k (\Lambda_a^k S^{ab} p_b - \lambda^{ka} \rho_a) = M_k (\theta^k \phi^b p_b - \theta^k \theta^b \rho_b) = M (\phi^a p_a - \theta^a \rho_a), \quad (27)$$

where we set $M_k \theta^k = M$. ρ can be written in terms of m by transformation from the particle rest frame.

$$\rho_b = -\tilde{\Lambda}_b^0 m. \quad (28)$$

Then $-\theta^a \rho_a = \theta^a \tilde{\Lambda}_a^0 m$ and we get another variable $\phi^* = \theta^a \tilde{\Lambda}_a^0$ anticommuting with the other Grassmann variables, but it is not independent of the others (in fact, $\phi^0 \phi^1 \phi^2 \phi^3 \phi^* = 0$). Therefore the classical lagrangian becomes

$$\mathcal{L} = p^a \dot{x}_a - \frac{1}{2} \phi^a \dot{\phi}_a - \frac{1}{2} \phi^* \dot{\phi}^* - N (p^2 + m^2) - M (p^a \phi_a + m \phi^*) + v \phi^0 \phi^1 \phi^2 \phi^3 \phi^*, \quad (29)$$

where the new dynamical variable ϕ^* is treated dynamically so that the constraint, $p^a \phi_a + m \phi^* = 0$, becomes the first class. And the last term, accounting for its dependency on others, is included due to the Grassmann nature.

The transformation properties of those Grassmann dynamical variables are straightforwardly obtained as

$$\bar{\phi}^a = \bar{\Lambda}^a_b \theta^b = \Lambda'^a_c \Lambda^c_b \theta^b = \Lambda'^a_c \phi^c, \quad (30)$$

$$\bar{\phi}^* = \theta^a \tilde{\Lambda}_a^0 = \phi^*, \quad (31)$$

where $\tilde{\Lambda}$ denotes the transformation from the particle rest frame to the initial frame where the ρ^a and λ^{ab} are taken. Now we see the ϕ 's have the same property as ψ 's and hence they can be identified. So the lagrangian (29) is exactly the same as the one (24) except the last constraint term on ϕ^* . But this term may be absorbed into M by redefinition, thus gives no extra effect at the classical level. In the quantum case, the story becomes a little different. In odd dimension, the quantum version of the corresponding constraint plays an important role of projection operator to decrease the degrees of freedom of the irreducible representation for the quantized algebra of Grassmann variables (Clifford algebra), thus gives the correct dimensionality of Dirac spinor [11]¹. In even dimension the projection operator becomes trivial and the constraint is just the irreducibility condition for Clifford algebra.

Let us conclude this letter with some remarks and summary. In this paper, the relation between classical and pseudo-classical lagrangian for the spinning particle has been established through ‘the pseudo-classical representation’ of the initial spin components λ^{ab} . Throughout that procedure, we have learned that

1. Lorentz group elements are deeply related with Grassmann elements to change the spin variable pseudo-classically and
2. ‘Hopf projection’ specifies nothing but the transformation property of spin components.
3. The ‘implicit’ constraints of classical lagrangian have been made to be ‘explicit’, and
4. through that procedure ψ^* is introduced naturally. And we learned that
5. so introduced ψ^* carries the information of the transformation from the particle rest frame at every instant to the ‘initial’ frame.
6. We gave it dynamics with the specification of another constraint $\psi^0 \psi^1 \psi^2 \psi^3 \psi^* = 0$, which turns out to do an important role in odd dimension, i.e., to give the pseudo-classical description of massive spinning particle in such dimensions.

¹ where the same lagrangian is derived in another way.

All these arguments are irrespective of the space-time dimension. We hope this work to give some hints for the study of Poincaré group manifold. And the study of supersymmetry through this formalism will be very interesting. Those works are in progress.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by the Korean Science and Engineering Foundation.

Appendix

Theorem. Let $\psi^a = K^a_b \theta^b$, $\theta \in \text{Grassmann}$. Then $K^a_b K_a^c = \delta_b^c$, i.e., $K \in SO(3, 1)$.

proof.

Since ψ^a is linear in θ , we have

$$\frac{\partial \psi^a}{\partial \theta^b} \theta^b = \psi^a.$$

And

$$\psi^a \psi^b = K^a_c K^b_d \theta^c \theta^d = -K^a_c K^b_d \theta^d \theta^c = -\psi^b \psi^a.$$

Therefore $\psi_a \frac{\partial \psi^a}{\partial \theta^b} \theta^b = \psi_a \psi^a = 0$ implies

$$\psi_a \frac{\partial \psi^a}{\partial \theta^b} = k \theta_b.$$

Thus,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_a} (\psi_c \frac{\partial \psi^c}{\partial \theta^b}) = \frac{\partial \psi_c}{\partial \theta_a} \frac{\partial \psi^c}{\partial \theta^b} = k \delta_b^a,$$

where the first equality holds because ψ^c is linear in θ^b .

We may redefine $\psi'^a = \frac{\psi^a}{\sqrt{k}}$ to get

$$\frac{\partial \psi'^c}{\partial \theta_a} \frac{\partial \psi'^c}{\partial \theta^b} = K'^a_c K'^c_b = \delta_b^a.$$

Hence $K' \in SO(3, 1)$.

References

- [1] P. A. M. Dirac, Proc. Roy. Soc.(London) **A117** (1928) 610.
- [2] A. Hanson, T. Regge and C. Teitelboim, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei (Roma, 1976).
- [3] A. P. Balachandran, G. Marmo, B.-S. Skagerstam and A. Stern, *Gauge Symmetries and Fiber Bundles*, (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983).
- [4] K. Gupta and A. Stern , Phys. Rev. **D44** (1991) 2432.
- [5] F. A. Berezin and M. S. Marinov, Ann. Phys. **104** (1977) 336.
- [6] L. Brink, P. Di Vecchia and P. Howe, Nucl. Phys. **B118** (1977) 76.
- [7] A. Barducci, R. Casalbuoni and L. Lusanna, Il Nuovo Cimento **35A** (1976) 377.
- [8] M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, Ann. Phys. **143** (1982) 127.
- [9] A. M. Polyakov, *Gauge Fields and Strings*, (Harwood academic publishers, Chur, 1987).
- [10] C. A. P. Galvao and C. Teitelboim , J. Math. Phys. **21** (1980) 1863.
- [11] M. S. Plyushchy, “Pseudoclassical Description of the Massive Spinning Particle in d Dimension,” IHEP Preprint